

REMARKS

Claims 41-51, 53, 54, 57, 60-62, and 64-66 are pending in this application. Claims 51, 54, 57, and 60 have been withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, as defined by Claims 41-50, 53, 61, 62, and 64-66, is patentable over the prior art. In this regard, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections of Claims 41-50, 53, 61, 62, and 64-66, and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejections of Claims 41-50, 53, 61, 62, and 64-66 be withdrawn.

Based on the following Remarks, the application is deemed to be in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested.

I. THE 35 U.S.C. §103(a) REJECTIONS:

The Examiner asserts that Claims 41-50, 53, 61, 62, and 64-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Laval, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,173,209 (Laval) in view of Austin American Statesmen (Austin American Statesmen) and Gebb, U.S. Patent No. 6,067,532 (Gebb) and Walker, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,107,932 (Walker). Applicant

respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, as defined by Claims 41-50, 53, 61, 62, and 64-66, is patentable over the prior art.

IA. THE PRESENT INVENTION, AS DEFINED BY CLAIMS 41-50, 53, 61, 62, AND 64, IS PATENTABLE OVER THE PRIOR ART:

Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, as defined by Claims 41-50, 53, 61, 62, and 64, is patentable over the prior art. Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, as defined by independent Claim 41, is patentable over the prior art.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's reasons for rejecting independent Claim 41, provided at pages 3-9 of the Office Action, mailed January 23, 2009, are untenable and should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner failed to consider all of the claim limitations of independent Claim 41, and Applicant further respectfully submits that the combination of references proposed by the Examiner does not disclose, teach, or suggest, all of the limitations of independent Claim 41.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner failed to consider all of the claim limitations of independent Claim 41 in his rejection of said independent Claim in his comments provided at pages 3-9 of the Office Action, mailed January 23, 2009. It is longstanding law that all claim limitations must be considered in judging patentability. In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385 (CCPA 1970) ("All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against prior art.").

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner failed to consider all of the claim limitations of independent Claim 41. For example, on page 3 of the Office Action, mailed January 23, 2009, the Examiner merely asserted that Laval "discloses wherein the event is at least one of a game, an athletic even, a competition, a performance, a concert, and a tournament and further the event is an event which takes place at or in at least one of a stadium, an arena, a theatre, a movie theatre, a concert hall, a museum, and a performance hall (see at least, col. 5, lines 41-55), and further wherein the ticket for the entire event corresponds to a seat or seats at the at least one of a stadium, an arena, a theatre, a movie theatre, a concert hall, a museum, and a performance hall, for the event, wherein the ticket for the entire event (see at

least, col. 6, 1-18: the examiner notes a 'spot' can be a seat (e.g. at a stage) and further runs for the entire attraction (e.g. performance at a stage)). Further Laval, et al. discloses that individuals who have access to these spots and decide not to return to access the attraction (e.g. stage) then the spots can be filled by other customers (see at least, col. 6, lines 1-18) via the use of a validator (see at least, col. 6, lines 19-25).". See Office Action, mailed January 23, 2009, page 3, lines 7-19. For example, Applicant submits that the Examiner, in relying on Laval as the primary reference to support his asserted rejection, failed to consider all of the claim limitations recited in the "storing information regarding a ticket request . . ." limitation of independent Claim 41.

As and for another example, on page 8, lines 4-10, of the Office Action, mailed January 23, 2009, the Examiner asserts: "But, Walker discloses receiving and storing information regarding an available ticket wherein the information regarding an available ticket for an event is transmitted from a first communication device and is received by a receiver wherein the processing device processes the information regarding a ticket request or a ticket option request using the information regarding an available ticket

(see at least, abstract and col. 4, lines 46-67 and col. 8, lines 54-67 and FIG. 5)." Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner failed to consider all of the claim limitations of the pertinent portion of Claim 41 which recite: "receiving and storing information regarding an available ticket for a portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event either prior to a start or a completion or a conclusion of the event or when the first individual or a third individual is leaving a venue of the event or leaving the event during the event and prior to a completion or a conclusion of the event, wherein the information regarding an available ticket for a portion of an event is transmitted from a first communication device and is received by a receiver". For example, the Examiner's comments failed to consider the claim limitations after "an available ticket" which, for example, includes the limitations "for a portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event either prior to a start or a completion or a conclusion of the event or when the first individual or a third individual is leaving a venue of the event or leaving the event during the event and prior to a completion or a conclusion of the event, wherein the information regarding an available ticket for a portion of an event is transmitted from a first communication

device and is received by a receiver". In this regard, the Examiner also failed to consider all of the claim limitations of the "receiving and storing information regarding . . ." limitation of independent Claim 41.

Since the Examiner failed to consider all of the claim limitations of independent Claim 41, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 41, based on obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, is untenable and should be withdrawn. In this regard, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 41 be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that the present invention, as defined by independent Claim 41, is patentable over Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same. Applicant submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, many of the specifically recited features of independent Claim 41 and, therefore, Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, all of the features of independent Claim 41.

Applicant respectfully submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, a computer-implemented method, comprising storing information regarding a ticket request or a ticket option request for at least one of a ticket for a portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event and a ticket option for a portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event, wherein the ticket for a portion of the event or the ticket option for a portion of the event is derived from a ticket for an entire event, wherein the event is at least one of a game, an athletic event, a competition, a performance, a concert, and a tournament, and further wherein the event is an event which takes place at or in at least one of a stadium, an arena, a theatre, a movie theatre, a concert hall, a museum, and a performance hall, and further wherein the ticket for the entire event corresponds to a seat or seats at the at least one of a stadium, an arena, a theatre, a movie theatre, a concert hall, a museum, and a performance hall, for the event, wherein the ticket for the entire event is purchased from a ticket issuer by a first individual having a ticket account, and further wherein the ticket for a portion of the event or the ticket option for a portion of the event

is purchased by or used by a second individual during the event and before the completion or the conclusion of the event with a payment for a purchase or a use of the ticket for a portion of the event, or a payment for a purchase or a use of the ticket option for a portion of the event, being made to the ticket account of the first individual, receiving and storing information regarding an available ticket for a portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event either prior to a start or a completion or a conclusion of the event or when the first individual or a third individual is leaving a venue of the event or leaving the event during the event and prior to a completion or a conclusion of the event, wherein the information regarding an available ticket for a portion of an event is transmitted from a first communication device and is received by a receiver, processing the information regarding a ticket request or a ticket option request for at least one of a ticket for a portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event and a ticket option for a portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event with a processing device, wherein the processing device processes the information regarding a ticket request or a ticket option

request using the information regarding an available ticket, generating at least one of a ticket availability message and a ticket option availability message, wherein the at least one of a ticket availability message and a ticket option availability message contains information regarding at least one of a ticket for a portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event and a ticket option for a portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event, wherein the at least one of a ticket availability message and a ticket option availability message is generated before a completion or a conclusion of the event, and transmitting the at least one of a ticket availability message and a ticket option availability message to a second communication device associated with or used by the second individual or a fourth individual, wherein the at least one of a ticket availability message and a ticket option availability message is transmitted to the second communication device before a completion or a conclusion of the event, all of which features are specifically recited features of independent Claim 41.

Applicant submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not

disclose, teach, or suggest, the recited computer-implemented method, comprising storing the recited information regarding the recited ticket request or the recited ticket option request for at least one of the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event and the recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event, wherein the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event or the recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event is derived from the recited ticket for the recited entire event, which recited event is at least one of a game, an athletic event, a competition, a performance, a concert, and a tournament, and which recited event is an event which takes place at or in at least one of a stadium, an arena, a theatre, a movie theatre, a concert hall, a museum, and a performance hall.

Applicant further submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, the recited ticket for the recited entire event which corresponds to a seat or seats at the at least one of a stadium, an arena, a theatre, a movie

theatre, a concert hall, a museum, and a performance hall, for the recited event, and wherein the recited ticket for the recited entire event is purchased from a ticket issuer by a first individual having the recited ticket account, and further wherein the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event or the recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event is purchased by or used by a second individual during the recited event and before the completion or the conclusion of the recited event with a payment for a purchase or a use of the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event, or a payment for a purchase or a use of the recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event, being made to the recited ticket account of the first individual.

Applicant respectfully submits that Austin American Statesman does not advance the Examiner's case. Applicant respectfully submits that Austin American Statesman merely discloses a practice of reselling multiple day Disney passes "with a day or two not yet used". Applicant respectfully submits that Austin American Statesman, like Laval, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, does not disclose, teach, or suggest, the recited at least one of the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of

the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event and the recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event, wherein the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event or the recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event is derived from the recited ticket for the recited entire event, which recited event is at least one of a game, an athletic event, a competition, a performance, a concert, and a tournament.

Applicant further submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, receiving and storing the recited information regarding the recited available ticket for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event either prior to a start or a completion or a conclusion of the recited event or when the first individual or a third individual is leaving a venue of the recited event or leaving the recited event during the recited event and prior to a completion or a conclusion of the recited event, wherein the recited information regarding the recited available ticket for a portion of the recited event is

transmitted from the recited first communication device and is received by the recited receiver.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's reliance on Walker does not advance the Examiner's case. As noted above, the Examiner failed to consider all of the claim limitations of independent Claim 41 when he relied upon Walker. In particular, the Examiner failed to consider the recited information regarding the recited available ticket for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event either prior to a start or a completion or a conclusion of the recited event or when the first individual or a third individual is leaving a venue of the recited event or leaving the recited event during the recited event and prior to a completion or a conclusion of the recited event, wherein the recited information regarding the recited available ticket for a portion of the recited event is transmitted from the recited first communication device and is received by the recited receiver.

Applicant further submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, processing the recited

information regarding the recited ticket request or the recited ticket option request for the recited at least one of the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event and the recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event with the recited processing device, wherein the recited processing device processes the recited information regarding the recited ticket request or the recited ticket option request using the recited information regarding the recited available ticket.

Applicant further submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, generating the recited at least one of the recited ticket availability message and the recited ticket option availability message, wherein the recited at least one of the recited ticket availability message and the recited ticket option availability message contains the recited information regarding the recited at least one of the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event and the

recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event, wherein the recited at least one of the recited ticket availability message and the recited ticket option availability message is generated before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event.

Lastly, Applicant submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, transmitting the recited at least one of the recited ticket availability message and the recited ticket option availability message to the recited second communication device associated with or used by the second individual or a fourth individual, wherein the recited at least one of the recited ticket availability message and the recited ticket option availability message is transmitted to the recited second communication device before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, many of the specifically recited features of

independent Claim 41 and, therefore, Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, all of the features of independent Claim 41.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, as defined by independent Claim 41, is patentable over Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, as defined by independent Claim 41, is patentable over the prior art. Allowance of independent Claim 41 is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Applicant further submits that Claims 42-50, 53, 61, 62, and 64, which Claims depend either directly or indirectly from independent Claim 41, so as to include all of the limitations of independent Claim 41, are also patentable over the prior art as said Claims 42-50, 53, 61, 62, and 64 depend from allowable subject matter.

Allowance of pending Claims 41-50, 53, 61, 62, and 64 is, therefore, respectfully requested.

**IB. THE PRESENT INVENTION, AS DEFINED BY CLAIMS 65 AND 66, IS
PATENTABLE OVER THE PRIOR ART:**

Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, as defined by Claims 65 and 66, is patentable over the prior art. Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, as defined by independent Claim 65, is patentable over the prior art.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's reasons for rejecting independent Claim 65, provided at pages 3-9 of the Office Action, mailed January 23, 2009, are untenable and should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner failed to consider all of the claim limitations of independent Claim 65, and Applicant further respectfully submits that the combination of references proposed by the Examiner does not disclose, teach, or suggest, all of the limitations of independent Claim 65.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner failed to consider all of the claim limitations of independent Claim 65 in his rejection of said independent Claim in his comments provided at pages 3-9 of the Office Action, mailed January 23, 2009. As noted above, it is longstanding law that

all claim limitations must be considered in judging patentability. In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385 (CCPA 1970) ("All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against prior art.").

Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner failed to consider all of the claim limitations of independent Claim 65. For example, on page 3 of the Office Action, mailed January 23, 2009, the Examiner merely asserted that Laval "discloses wherein the event is at least one of a game, an athletic even, a competition, a performance, a concert, and a tournament and further the event is an event which takes place at or in at least one of a stadium, an arena, a theatre, a movie theatre, a concert hall, a museum, and a performance hall (see at least, col. 5, lines 41-55), and further wherein the ticket for the entire event corresponds to a seat or seats at the at least one of a stadium, an arena, a theatre, a movie theatre, a concert hall, a museum, and a performance hall, for the event, wherein the ticket for the entire event (see at least, col. 6, 1-18: the examiner notes a 'spot' can be a seat (e.g. at a stage) and further runs for the entire attraction (e.g. performance at a stage)). Further Laval, et al. discloses that individuals who have access to these spots and decide not to return to access the attraction (e.g. stage)

then the spots can be filled by other customers (see at least, col. 6, lines 1-18) via the use of a validator (see at least, col. 6, lines 19-25)." See Office Action, mailed January 23, 2009, page 3, lines 7-19. For example, Applicant submits that the Examiner, in relying on Laval as the primary reference to support his asserted rejection, failed to consider all of the claim limitations recited in the "storing information regarding a ticket request . . ." limitation of independent Claim 65.

As noted above, as and for another example, on page 8, lines 4-10, of the Office Action, mailed January 23, 2009, the Examiner asserts: "But, Walker discloses receiving and storing information regarding an available ticket wherein the information regarding an available ticket for an event is transmitted from a first communication device and is received by a receiver wherein the processing device processes the information regarding a ticket request or a ticket option request using the information regarding an available ticket (see at least, abstract and col. 4, lines 46-67 and col. 8, lines 54-67 and FIG. 5)." Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner failed to consider all of the claim limitations of the pertinent portion of Claim 65 which recites: "receiving and storing information regarding an available ticket for a

portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event when the first individual or a third individual is leaving a venue of the event or leaving the event during the event and prior to a completion or a conclusion of the event, wherein the information regarding an available ticket for a portion of an event is transmitted from a first communication device and is received by a receiver". For example, the Examiner's comments failed to consider the claim limitations after "an available ticket" which, for example, includes the limitations "for a portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event when the first individual or a third individual is leaving a venue of the event or leaving the event during the event and prior to a completion or a conclusion of the event, wherein the information regarding an available ticket for a portion of an event is transmitted from a first communication device and is received by a receiver". In this regard, the Examiner also failed to consider all of the claim limitations of the "receiving and storing information regarding . . ." limitation of independent Claim 65.

Since the Examiner failed to consider all of the claim limitations of independent Claim 65, Applicant respectfully

submits that the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 65, based on obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, is untenable and should be withdrawn. In this regard, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of independent Claim 65 be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that the present invention, as defined by independent Claim 65, is patentable over Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same. Applicant submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, many of the specifically recited features of independent Claim 65 and, therefore, Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, all of the features of independent Claim 65.

Applicant respectfully submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, a computer-implemented method, comprising storing information regarding a ticket request or a ticket option request for at least one of a ticket for a portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the

event and a ticket option for a portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event, wherein the ticket for a portion of the event or the ticket option for a portion of the event is derived from a ticket for an entire event, wherein the event is at least one of a game, an athletic event, a competition, a performance, a concert, and a tournament, and further wherein the event is an event which takes place at or in at least one of a stadium, an arena, a theatre, a movie theatre, a concert hall, a museum, and a performance hall, and further wherein the ticket for the entire event corresponds to a seat or seats at the at least one of a stadium, an arena, a theatre, a movie theatre, a concert hall, a museum, and a performance hall, for the event, wherein the ticket for the entire event is purchased from a ticket issuer by a first individual having a ticket account, and further wherein the ticket for a portion of the event or the ticket option for a portion of the event is purchased by or used by a second individual during the event and before the completion or the conclusion of the event with a payment for a purchase or a use of the ticket for a portion of the event, or a payment for a purchase or a use of the ticket option for a portion of the event, being made to the ticket account of the first individual, receiving and storing information regarding an available ticket for a

portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event when the first individual or a third individual is leaving a venue of the event or leaving the event during the event and prior to a completion or a conclusion of the event, wherein the information regarding an available ticket for a portion of an event is transmitted from a first communication device and is received by a receiver, processing the information regarding a ticket request or a ticket option request for at least one of a ticket for a portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event and a ticket option for a portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event with a processing device, wherein the processing device processes the information regarding a ticket request or a ticket option request using the information regarding an available ticket, generating at least one of a ticket availability message and a ticket option availability message, wherein the at least one of a ticket availability message and a ticket option availability message contains information regarding at least one of a ticket for a portion of an event which remains after a start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event and a ticket option for a portion of an event which remains after a

start of the event and before a completion or a conclusion of the event, wherein the at least one of a ticket availability message and a ticket option availability message is generated before a completion or a conclusion of the event, and transmitting the at least one of a ticket availability message and a ticket option availability message to a second communication device associated with or used by the second individual or a fourth individual, wherein the at least one of a ticket availability message and a ticket option availability message is transmitted to the communication device before a completion or a conclusion of the event, all of which features are specifically recited features of independent Claim 65.

Applicant submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, the recited computer-implemented method, comprising storing the recited information regarding the recited ticket request or the recited ticket option request for the recited at least one of the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event and the recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the

recited event, wherein the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event or the recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event is derived from the recited ticket for the recited entire event, wherein the recited event is at least one of a game, an athletic event, a competition, a performance, a concert, and a tournament, and further wherein the recited event is an event which takes place at or in at least one of a stadium, an arena, a theatre, a movie theatre, a concert hall, a museum, and a performance hall.

Applicant submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, the recited ticket for the recited entire event which corresponds to a seat or seats at the at least one of a stadium, an arena, a theatre, a movie theatre, a concert hall, a museum, and a performance hall, for the recited event, wherein the recited ticket for the recited entire event is purchased from a ticket issuer by a first individual having the recited ticket account, and further wherein the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event or the recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event is purchased by or used by a second individual during the recited event and before the completion or the conclusion of the recited event with a payment for a purchase or a use of

the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event, or a payment for a purchase or a use of the recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event, being made to the recited ticket account of the first individual.

Applicant respectfully submits that Austin American Statesman does not advance the Examiner's case. Applicant respectfully submits that Austin American Statesman merely discloses a practice of reselling multiple day Disney passes "with a day or two not yet used". Applicant respectfully submits that Austin American Statesman, like Laval, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, does not disclose, teach, or suggest, the recited at least one of the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event and the recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event, wherein the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event or the recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event is derived from the recited ticket for the recited entire event, which recited event is at least one of a game, an athletic event, a competition, a performance, a concert, and a tournament.

Applicant submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, receiving and storing the recited information regarding the recited available ticket for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event when the first individual or a third individual is leaving a venue of the recited event or leaving the recited event during the recited event and prior to a completion or a conclusion of the recited event, wherein the recited information regarding the recited available ticket for a portion of the recited event is transmitted from the recited first communication device and is received by the recited receiver.

Applicant submits that the Examiner's reliance on Walker does not advance the Examiner's case. As noted above, the Examiner failed to consider all of the claim limitations of Claim 65 when he relied upon Walker. In particular, the Examiner failed to consider the recited information regarding the recited available ticket for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event when the first individual or a third individual is leaving a venue

of the recited event or leaving the recited event during the recited event and prior to a completion or a conclusion of the recited event, wherein the recited information regarding the recited available ticket for a portion of the recited event is transmitted from the recited first communication device and is received by the recited receiver.

Applicant further submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, processing the recited information regarding the recited ticket request or the recited ticket option request for the recited at least one of the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event and the recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event with the recited processing device, wherein the recited processing device processes the recited information regarding the recited ticket request or the recited ticket option request using the recited information regarding the recited available ticket.

Applicant submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, generating the recited at least one of the recited ticket availability message and the recited ticket option availability message, wherein the recited at least one of the recited ticket availability message and the recited ticket option availability message contains the recited information regarding the recited at least one of the recited ticket for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event and the recited ticket option for a portion of the recited event which remains after a start of the recited event and before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event, wherein the recited at least one of the recited ticket availability message and the recited ticket option availability message is generated before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event.

Lastly, Applicant submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, transmitting the recited at least one of the recited ticket availability message and the recited ticket option availability message to the recited second

communication device associated with or used by the second individual or a fourth individual, wherein the recited at least one of the recited ticket availability message and the recited ticket option availability message is transmitted to the recited communication device before a completion or a conclusion of the recited event.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, many of the specifically recited features of independent Claim 65 and, therefore, Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same, do not disclose, teach, or suggest, all of the features of independent Claim 65.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, as defined by independent Claim 65, is patentable over Laval, Austin American Statesmen, Gebb, Walker, and any combination of same. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention, as defined by independent Claim 65, is patentable over the prior art. Allowance of independent Claim 65 is, therefore, respectfully requested.


Applicant further submits that Claim 66, which Claim depends directly from independent Claim 65, so as to include all of the limitations of independent Claim 65, is also patentable over the prior art as said Claim 66 depends from allowable subject matter.

Allowance of pending Claims 65 and 66 is, therefore, respectfully requested.

II. CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing, the application is deemed to be in condition for allowance and action to that end is respectfully requested. Allowance of pending Claims 41-50, 53, 61, 62, and 64-66 is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,


Raymond A. Joao
Reg. No. 35,907

April 20, 2009

Raymond A. Joao, Esq.
122 Bellevue Place
Yonkers, New York 10703
(914) 969-2992

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☒ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:**

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.